
**Suggestions from Gary A-K regarding
Possible Objectives
Associated with the proposed IT Strategic Plan Goals**

Goal #1: Lower the cost and improve the reliability of State IT infrastructure

(Note: Most of the 'objectives' included under Goal 2: Security also would fit under Goal 1)

- A. Require the establishment, oversight, and centralized management of a statewide network interconnecting state organizations and providing the connectivity to the Internet (e.g., CSGNet with a mandate). (Still provides organizations the latitude to explore the best price options for their "private network" within their organizations.)
- B. Require the establishment, coordination, and centralized management of the network resources by which videoconferencing services are provided in State organizations (this will provide a lower cost alternative to current piecemeal implementations and will effectively centralize information regarding the availability of these types of resources ... Organizations will still have the latitude to expend resources based on their business need, but they will be less likely to waste resources!).

Goal #2: Ensure that State IT systems are secure

- A. Establish/improve the process for the development of annual security plans in each organization (This could almost be a Checksheet approach)
- B. Ensure that all State Internet access occurs through a centrally-managed communication link with appropriate intrusion detection and intrusion prevention capabilities in place
- C. Ensure that all desktop computer systems are using licensed anti-virus software and that an automated anti-virus signature file update process is implemented and functions correctly ... Centrally-managed to the extent possible.
- D. Ensure that all general purpose and application servers are protected based on automated monitoring and anti-virus software installation ... Centrally-managed to the extent possible.
- E. Implement a centrally-managed capability to provide Web content filtering
- F. Implement a centrally-managed capability to provide E-mail Anti-Spam/Anti-Virus filtering

Goal #3: Make smart services (e-government) easily available to California Residents and state clients

- A. Establish a centralized service for secure payment processing for Web-based services ... so that each State organization does not have to implement this technology
- B. Establish a centralized service for several levels of secure client authentication ... so that each State organization does not have to implement this technology
- C. Sponsor legislation that at least temporarily allows an Executive Director to authorize the operation of an electronic payment service without passing external processing charges on to the consumer under the requirement that the Executive Director identify existing

funding that will be reduced to offset the increase due to processing charges (i.e., cost neutral)

- D. Identify 2-5 pilot projects for e-government services that will be implemented under the auspices/sponsorship of the State CIO's Office, contingent upon approval of funding.

Goal #4: Develop enterprise-wide applications to improve governmental efficiency and cost-effectiveness

- A. Develop a full-featured State Intranet which handles Time Accounting, Travel Expense Claim processing, and personnel benefits change requests (health plan, dependent deductions, etc.) for all State organizations. (21st Century project covers much of this ... Just want to make sure it gets completed within the 21st century – timelines are pretty long!)
- B. Develop a Statewide fully-functioning LDAP directory (for E-mail address resolution) with Web-based access for use as a Statewide personnel directory and a separate interface for public access to a subset of the information

Goal #5: Improve IT organizational capacity (workforce related)

- A. Provide more options for the State in addressing the under-performance of a small portion of the State's IT workforce:
Establish and implement a "1% Rule". The public sector is significantly disadvantaged by the fact that there is some small portion of the workforce that has chosen a career path for which they are fundamentally not well-suited. While these persons do not commit such egregious errors or violations as to justify dismissal through normal personnel procedures, they are a constant drain on the overall effectiveness of the organization. In simpler words, these employees simply are "not a good fit" in the career path they've selected. They are the "1%" that reduce the overall effectiveness of their current work environment by "5%". While the existing personnel processes may work well for the State in dealing with the other 99% of the staff, they do not work well for this group of employees. What is required to effectively address this issue is to provide the State with an option that is analogous to a "peremptory" challenge in a courtroom setting. Basically, the Executive Director or most senior-level executive officer within an organization would be provided the option of reassigning or excusing not more than 1% of the workforce within any given Fiscal Year (e.g., 10 employees within a 1,000 employee organization). This can be developed in such a way as to ensure adequate options and protections for all parties concerned (e.g., any employee excused or reassigned under the "1%" rule would continue to receive his/her salary for a 3 [or 6 or 12] month time period. If they found alternate employment during that time period for which the salary was less than their prior salary, then that difference would be paid by the State. Health benefits would be provided by the State for a period of 6 [or 12 or 24] months. An employee excused or reassigned under the "1%" rule would in no way be restricted from pursuing re-employment or other positions within the State. The State would be restricted from re-filling the position for essentially the same period of time that salary and benefits continued to be paid to an employee excused or reassigned under the "1%" rule [i.e., this option must be cost neutral for the State].)

While this approach is a radical departure from the current norm, it is perhaps not as "far out" as it seems. Executive Directors have the latitude to "temporarily expand" their organizations through contracting for consulting or other services, in addition to other options. Is it not reasonable that they should be given the same latitude to at least

"temporarily shrink" their organization if that is what is needed to provide the most effective operation of the organization?

(I also realize this is perhaps not the best forum or medium for getting this idea introduced ... Evaluate and keep or discard as you see fit).

- B.** Provide Web-based and/or in-person examination and review for most/all state civil service IT positions to expedite the establishment of 'certification lists'. Outsource the development of the testing criteria, much of the interview process, and the scoring and assessment of applicants..

Goal #6: Develop an IT governance structure at departmental, state and intergovernmental levels

- A.** Implement the proposed structure outlined in AB 2609 related to the establishment of the Department of Technology
- B.** Formally establish the role of the State IT Council